DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 166 214 TM 007 841

AUTHOR Walder, Leopold O.; And Others
TITLE ESEA Title IV. Special Education Television Reading Program. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Behavior Service Consultants, Inc., Greenbelt, Md.
SPONS AGENCY District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Jul 78
CONTRACT 0478-AA-NS-0-8-GA
NOTE 54p.; Appendices may not reproduce well due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Television; Elementary Secondary Education; Low Achievers; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Reading Achievement; *Reading Improvement; Reading Interests; *Remedial Reading Programs; Student Motivation

ABSTRACT

The problems in implementing and evaluating a television project for teaching reading in thirteen District of Columbia schools are described, and the opinion is offered that the project was successful in producing a rapid improvement in the students' interest in improving their reading ability. Participants were 300 students in grades four through seven and in grade ten who were reading two or more years below grade level. The project was in operation for periods varying from two to four months because of delays in the delivery of essential equipment. A list of data summary tables and attitude questionnaires are appended. Raw data and summary tables are available from the evaluators. (Author/CTM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED166214

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

ESEA Title IV

Special Education Television Reading Program

Division of Research and Evaluation
Public Schools of the District of Columbia

July 1978

N.S. Contract No. 0478-AA-NS-0-8-GA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Cooper
D.C. Public Schools

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Coordinated under the Direction of:

Division of Research and Evaluation
Room 1013
415 - 12th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20004

Prepared by:

Leopold O. Walder, Principal Investigator
Linda J. Cimarusti
Marcella G. Walder

Behavior Service Consultants, Inc.
133 Centerway, Box 97
Greenbelt, Maryland 20770

(301) 474-2146

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

2/3

We would like to acknowledge those persons whose assistance made possible the implementation and evaluation of this project.

Vincent E. Reed
Superintendent of Schools

Harris M. Taylor
Associate Superintendent for
State Administration

James T. Guines
Associate Superintendent
for Instruction

Richard K. Henning
Supervising Director for the
Division of Special Education
Region III

Charles H. C. White
Director
Special Education Television
Reading Program

Mildred P. Cooper
Assistant Superintendent
Research and Evaluation

Lavolia W. Vails
Director of Evaluation of
ESEA Title IV, Part B and C

Table of Contents

I. Purpose . . . . . Page 1

II. Rationale for Program . . . . . Page 2

III. Comments and Recommendations. . . . . Page 4

IV. Evaluation Design and Procedures. . . . . Page 7

A. Process Variables . . . . . Page 7

B. Outcome Variables . . . . . Page 8

V. Results by Program Objective. . . . . Page 10

A. Primary Objective . . . . . Page 10

B. Other Program Objectives. . . . . Page 13

VI. Selected References . . . . . Page 17

VII. Appendices. . . . . Page 18

A. Discussion of Estes Attitude Scale and the Powell Behavior Rating Inventory

B. Face to Face Interview/Program Personnel

C. Face to Face Interview/Student

D. Paper and Pencil Questionnaire/Program Personnel

E. Paper and Pencil Questionnaire/Student

F. Paper and Pencil Questionnaire/Parent

G. Direct Observation Checklist

H. List of Tables
(Developed by evaluators and available upon request)

VIII. Attachments . . . . . Page 43

1. Evaluation Form Developed by Program Personnel

2. Estes Attitude Scale

3. Powell Behavior Rating Inventory Scoring Information

4. Powell Behavior Rating Inventory

5. Lending Library Form

I. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to present the findings of an evaluation of the Special Education Television Reading Program. An important issue is the amount of correspondence between the objectives of the program and its accomplishments. A second central issue is the examination of the events or circumstances that have facilitated the achievement or modification of program goals.

The program was implemented in some classrooms in February 1978 and in others as late as April 1978 although teacher training had commenced by January 1978.

This evaluation was conducted in May and June 1978.

II. Rationale for Program

The District of Columbia Public Schools has chosen as one of its major educational priorities the improvement of the reading ability of its students. Over the past several years, many innovative educational programs designed to increase reading skills have been proposed and implemented within the school system. In the design of such programs, the D. C. Public Schools must take into account issues that are germane to many urban school systems. The majority of the population of the D. C. Public Schools are children from a lower socio-economic class. The encouragement and reinforcement for reading given in the home may be insufficient to foster interest in and enthusiasm for the development of good reading skills. Traditional methods of teaching reading may not meet the needs of the specific population served.

It is overwhelmingly evident that today's child spends a substantial portion of time in front of the television set. Research studies that attest to the very powerful influence of television viewing on the psychological development of children are plentiful (e.g., Comstock, 1975; Lefkowitz, Eron, Walder & Huesmann, 1977, see section on social attainment, pp. 153-159; Liebert, Neale & Davidson, 1973, see chapter 6 "Television's potential: prosocial effects"; and Waters, 1977).

The Special Education Television Reading Program was planned for delivery to three-hundred students in grades four through seven and grade ten who were selected for participation on the basis of reading skill deficits and eligibility for special education services. Although services are provided to students "who are reading two or more years below grade level," this is perhaps an understatement of the problems of teaching reading to special education students. As observed in the classrooms, many of the students, particularly at the junior high school level, are much more significantly below grade level than such a statement would suggest. These students read, if at all, on a primer level.

The program utilizes the already established teaching capability of television to teach the necessary skill of reading. It provides a model of an educational technology that attempts to teach students by working with them "on their own ballfield." The presentation of videotapes of popular television programs may capture the attention and sustain the interest of students with a history of being "turned off" to academic activities. The use of television programs, according to this model, is as a tool to increase motivation to read, attend classes, and to improve reading skills all pointing to achievement of ability to function well in society.

The program was designed to provide these students with the opportunity to use scripts of television shows and to view videotapes of television shows as part of their reading curriculum. Instructional

activities were developed to complement these materials and equipment. Teachers were to be involved in extensive training in the use of these materials and in the development of instructional activities relevant to the goals and components of the program. There were to be parent and community involvement in the extension of classroom activities designed to reinforce in-school reading goals. The program plan also provided for formative and summative evaluation with an outside evaluator contracted to provide the consultation to the internal evaluation team and to perform an independent evaluation of the program processes and outcomes.

III. Comments and Recommendations

There is no question that television viewing is a controversial issue in our society! It has proven its ability to teach violence (Lefkowitz*). It has also proven its ability to teach language (Liebert*). It is a great electronic teacher. It is up to society to decide what television will teach. Some people have expressed great concern about the use of popular commercial television shows in the classroom. Too much entertainment; non-standard English; questionable values; a too soft alternative to the necessary harshness of solid learning are some of the concerns voiced.

This reading project tries to make this electronic teacher a part of a team which includes a well trained and motivated classroom teacher, well designed plans and materials, and, most important, special education youngsters who are behind in learning to read and less than motivated to continue their attack on the subject.

The findings from this outside evaluation show that the program, despite a late start (due in part to a dock strike which delayed the arrival of the video equipment) is functioning. The program plan, as well as what has been implemented, reflects much enthusiasm, hard work, and sophistication on the part of the program personnel. There are already signs of hoped for results.

On the basis of the preliminary data collected early in the life of the program, the evaluators present the following recommendations:

1. The Television Reading Program should be continued. It appears to build reading skills and academic interest in difficult to teach youngsters.

2. This program should be given an opportunity to develop slowly so that its good quality may be solidified, objectified, and made replicable.

3. More attention needs to be paid to developing the most effective ways of presenting the scripts themselves to the students.

4. Teacher training workshops should be continued, with continued input from the teachers and further emphasis on the less developed aspects of the program.

5. Classroom libraries need to be developed with a wide variety of appropriate materials.

6. Some related areas that might be drawn from for curriculum development are drama, dramatic criticism, television production, and providing the students with the opportunity to write, act in and videotape their own plays.

7. A parent training program and possibly a community component should be considered as a way of strengthening the program. Training parents to reinforce reading at home is essential.

8. More clerical and support services are needed by the project staff to better do their administrative, educational, and evaluation jobs.

9. The quality of evaluation should be increased. More realistic scheduling with enough lead time for the evaluator to have been hired well before the project starts to follow its progress throughout the year, and to be able to submit a final report with full data in it is necessary. This may necessitate slowing down possibly impatient educators, youngsters, parents and funders. This will provide the quality evaluation that projects such as this deserve.

10. The internal evaluation team should continue to quantify measurements and progress. Instruments such as the Estes Attitude Scale and the Powell Behavior Rating Inventory seem, with revisions, to be appropriate. Additional attention should be directed to standardized administration as well as appropriate scoring techniques. (See Appendix A for a further discussion of these instruments.)

11 Reliability and other psychometric data need to be collected on the Estes and the Powell measuring instruments. Independent ratings as well as classroom teachers' ratings should be obtained on the Powell.

12. The subsequent evaluations of this program should continue to include standardized tests, e.g., the Prescriptive Reading Test (PRT), as measuring instruments.

13. The system of scoring PRT's needs to be examined and perhaps speeded up.

14. Attitude scales should be administered to teachers at the start and end of each year.

15. Size of video screen should be analyzed and probably tested empirically.

The remainder of this report presents the findings of of the evaluation of the Television Reading Program by objectives. It necessarily includes brief discussion of the methods used to evaluate the program. Detailed analyses of the component parts are available from the evaluators. A list of the data summary tables developed is appended to this report, as is a discussion of the reliability and validity of instruments developed and used by both the internal and external evaluation teams. Raw data and summary tables are available and can be obtained from the evaluators.

IV. Evaluation Design and Procedures

The evaluation was based on hypotheses developed from the program objectives included in the program proposal and identified by program personnel. Process and outcome variables were identified and used to assess the correspondence between the objectives of the program and the extent of its achievements. The data were divided into process and outcome variables for purposes of analyses.

A. Process Variables

A Process Quantification Procedure (PQP) was designed by the evaluators to provide an objective index to the degree to which specific program components or processes were occurring and the amount of overall effectiveness of each process. These relationships could be assessed mathematically by analysis of contribution to program objectives. Components identified as relevant to the evaluation were:

1. Supplies and Materials
    a. procurement of tapes, scripts, and other materials
    b. procurement of audiovisual equipment
    c. distribution of equipment, tapes, scripts, etc.
    d. modification of materials (if necessary)
    e. development of materials
2. Training Activities
    a. training of program personnel
        i. program goals and processes
        ii. use of equipment
        iii. instructional activities
        iv. development of materials
    b. training of parents
        i. reinforcement of reading skills
        ii. access to copies of scripts
        iii. use of scripts to reinforce reading
3. Instructional Activities
    a. presentation of high interest audiovisual stimuli
    b. use of complementary scripts and other reading materials
    c. development of lesson plans and behavioral objectives
    d. reinforcement of good reading skills
    e. development of classroom libraries
    f. support of use of classroom libraries
4. Parent and Community Involvement
    a. dissemination of information
        i. Advisory Council Meetings, Parent/Home Meetings
        ii. newsletters, announcements, etc.
        iii. parent orientation session
        iv. parent-teacher conferences

5. Evaluation

   a. internal
      i. selection of student participants
      ii. administration of diagnostic and evaluative measuring instruments
      iii. program modification

   b. external
      i. development of appropriate evaluation design
      ii. evaluation activities
      iii. presentation of findings

B. Outcome Variables

Outcome measures included instruments designed to assess academic, attitudinal and behavioral progress. A brief discussion of each instrument is presented below.

1. Instruments used by Internal Evaluation Team

   a. Prescriptive Reading Test

This test, which provides pre and post test scores of academic achievement in reading, was built by McGraw-Hill in collaboration with D. C. Schools personnel. It is a criterion referenced rather than normed test, comparing a person's ability with a specified set of skills rather than with a standard group of peers. It was administered in the fall of 1977 and again in the spring of 1978. Printouts of the scores from McGraw-Hill were not available at the time of the writing of this report. Change scores, if available at a later date, may be analyzed and submitted as an addendum to this report. However, it is the outside evaluator's feeling that for this first year, so much of the academic year had elapsed between the pre test and the beginning of the Television Reading Program, and the duration of the program was so brief in some schools, that changes from the post test PRT scores could not be reliably related, either positively or negatively, to the Special Education Television Reading Program itself at this time.

   b. Estes Attitude Scale

This test provides pre and post test scores of attitude toward reading, books, and television viewing. The original scale was developed by T. H. Estes in 1969. The version used in the program was adapted by program personnel in order to better meet the needs of the Television Reading Program. It consists of twenty statements relevant to attitude toward reading, books and television viewing. It was administered by classroom or learning center teachers during February 1978 and again in May 1978. The evaluators believe that there is some evidence that standardized administration procedures were not followed. The test is meant to be group administered, with the student rating his/her degree of agreement with each item by choosing one of five answers, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The evaluators scored the raw data in a more complex way than that planned by the internal evaluation team. (Discussion of this scoring system and findings are included as Appendix A.)

The findings, which are preliminary and based upon small samples of data, show that between the pre and post testing there was a change from positive to even more positive attitude toward reading. Students also moved from negative toward a more positive attitude about television and showed a greater preference for reading after exposure to the program. These changes were greater in schools that had a more complete program in operation.

It is crucial that an evaluation be done next year to verify these early findings.

c. Powell Behavior Rating Inventory

This behavior rating chart was designed by a program teacher for use in the pilot study of the program. It is used to provide a quantifiable measure of a student's in and out of class behavior. It was administered by classroom and learning center teachers in February 1978 and again in May 1978. Instructions for administration, as well as a description of the parameters of each response category, were provided to the teachers. Pre and post measures yielded results that, based upon analysis by the evaluators, showed more appropriate and fewer inappropriate behaviors by junior high school age students with reading and behavior problems.

2. Instruments Developed by External Evaluation Team

Face to face interviews were conducted with program personnel paper and pencil questionnaires were administered to program administrators, teachers, students and parents, and classroom and workshop observations were made. Initial observations of facilities and participant interactions were made by two or more observers at the same time and place in order to check for interjudge agreement in the observations. Discussion and examination of the observation data obtained revealed a sufficiently high level of agreement concerning specific interactions, behaviors, equipments, and materials to allow the observers to continue making observations individually.

3. Sampling Plan and General Strategy for Data Analysis

Twenty-nine complete student data cases were able to be assembled; that is, cases for whom there were a completed student and a completed personnel process paper and pencil questionnaire as well as pre and post testings on the Estes Attitude Scale and the Powell Behavior Rating Inventory. These were supplemented by randomly selecting from five schools for which there was sufficient data enough additional data cases so that there was an even sample of cases from each school.

The responses of personnel to an evaluation form administered by the program director were analyzed. Ratings of the amount of the Television Reading Program in each of the five schools were compared with ratings by program personnel and by students. The purpose was

to show the relationship between amount of program in each school and the changes in the students' responses to the Estes Attitude Scale and the Powell Behavior Rating Inventory.

V. Results by Program Objective

A. Primary Objective

The major objective of the Special Education Television Reading Program is to provide students who are reading two or more years below grade level with a reading program that will lead to both increase in motivation to read and an improvement in reading skills.

1. Discussion of Overall Program

A television reading program was developed and implemented with approximately three-hundred special education students identified as having learning problems in reading and who are two or more years below grade level. The program is modeled upon and adapted from an already established Philadelphia, Pennsylvania school system program that is not geared to special education students. The Television Reading Program was piloted during the 1976-77 school year and the full program was scheduled to be implemented in thirteen schools in September 1977.

The program was not implemented in two of these schools--the parochial school where a teacher could not be released to attend the training sessions and another public school where security problems concerning equipment safety (television monitors, cassettes, etc.) necessitated the postponement of the start of the program. Thus, eleven of the thirteen schools included in the original plan participated in the federally funded program during this first year of operation. On the other hand, two additional elementary school regular classrooms were included in the Program (although they were not in this evaluation). Delays in obtaining equipment resulted in the late start of several program components, although teacher training was implemented according to schedule. Some schools have had the program in operation since February and others only since April 1978. This year, in effect, has been a start-up year.

A great deal of progress appears to have been made despite time and logistical constraints. It is possible to say at this point only that the students and teachers report that students' motivation to read has improved as have reading skills. The program personnel are very enthusiastic about the program and its effects.

The Television Reading Program has a number of elements which contribute to its sophistication: (1) There is a strong emphasis on pre and post testing. Some of the major findings in this evaluation were made possible by program personnels' attention to relevant

data gathering (e.g., the Estes, the Powell, staff evaluation form, the Pilot Project). (2) The teaching plans and supports are well conceived and organized. They are very detailed and comprehensive as well as being very varied in content and objectives. The crux of the program is that the teaching is closely tied to stimuli (television programs) which are interesting to the children. It takes a strong interest and wisely builds reading with the help of that strong interest. (3) A good literature search has been done. From it the staff has learned about a broad range of phases (equipment, materials, methods, etc.) of this approach to the teaching of reading. (4) The administrators have visited and built upon a major program already in existence and functioning. (5) It has been obvious to the evaluators that the program personnel are open to ideas. As we asked them questions, they asked us questions, interested in anything that might improve their program. (6) Their writing, test construction, publicity, etc. all show clarity of idea, direction, and motivation to do good work.

Along with this justly earned praise and endorsement come some less positive statements about this promising program. Although the evaluators observed superior teaching and well developed program materials in many classrooms, some classrooms were visited where the teachers reported they had just received their video equipment three or four weeks previously and had just gotten started. Therefore, the small amount of data the evaluators finally received reflects a program with variability in its stages of development, in the population served, in teaching skills of the teachers, in availability of materials, and in the implementation time of the program.

Positive changes reported by the data can be expected in spite of all the abovementioned factors because of the strength of the program development. However, the data available seem to show an unusually rapid change for such a new program.

2. Discussion of Specific Program Components

a. Implementation of a Teacher and Parent Training Component

Ten teacher training workshops were held, beginning in January and continuing through May 1978. Various program and non-program personnel, including the program director, the media specialist, and peer assistance teachers, served as trainers. The teachers themselves brought in and shared ideas and materials and so were quite active in their own training.

Workshops focused on such topics as "Developing Script Activities," "Evaluation of Student Progress" and "Use of Materials and Equipment."

The majority of teachers interviewed were enthusiastic about the workshops. They felt that they were valuable opportunities to learn new teaching techniques and share ideas and materials with one another. There was great variability in the workshops cited as most and least beneficial, with almost all workshops receiving endorsements for most and least beneficial. Clearly the workshops were varied enough to

meet the needs of many of the teachers a great deal of the time. Suggestions for future workshops included demonstrations of using specific lesson plans, preparing individualized instructional activities, and developing instructional materials.

b. Purchasing, Use and Modification of Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

The delivery of audiovisual equipment and videotapes, scheduled for the fall of 1977 was delayed because of a dock strike. Materials did not arrive in Washington, D. C. until the middle of January 1978.

Teaching staff seemed to be quite pleased with the equipment, describing it as "excellent," "easy to use" and "best equipment possible." A need for larger television screens and cameras was expressed by several of the teachers.

For the most part, only one script (Good Times*) has been used by the majority of the teachers. Teachers used many instructional materials that they had developed themselves. Examination of these games, worksheets, handouts, etc. showed them to be of good quality and quite relevant to the instructional objectives.

c. Implementation of an Instructional Component

The television shows were actually shown during a very small portion of the reading period. In many cases, the tapes were shown only a few times per week. The majority of class time was spent learning skills such as letter and sound recognition and pronunciation, grammatical concepts, sentence structure, etc. Small portions of the television program were shown to motivate and reinforce students to learn reading skills necessary to read the accompanying scripts.

d. Development and Implementation of Internal Evaluation Design

Training in methods of monitoring and assessing students' progress was provided to teachers. A workshop focusing on an overall evaluation by program personnel of the program's activities and accomplishments was held in May 1978. At this evaluation workshop, an Evaluation Form, developed by program administrators, was administered. The majority of the questions appeared to be of good quality and of relevance to the program objectives.

Pre and post measures of students' reading abilities (the PRT), students' attitudes towards television viewing and reading (an adaptation of the Estes Attitude Scale) and students in and out of class behavior (the Powell Behavior Rating Inventory) were administered by program personnel.

The measuring instruments used in the evaluation of a program are of paramount importance. For the most part, the measures used seem to have been selected wisely and appropriately. A discussion of the Estes Attitude Scale and the Powell Behavior Rating Inventory is appended to this report.

e. Parent and Community Involvement

The program personnel very much want parents and community members to become involved with the program. They hope to be able to not only increase parents' and community members' awareness of the program activities and its goals, but to train parents to use the television scripts to help reinforce their child's reading in the home.

We learned that to date parents have not received training in the home use of the scripts. Time constraints as a result of the delay in the start of the program made it necessary to postpone the start of parent training. It is part of the proposed program for the 1978-79 school year.

B. Other Program Objectives

Five specific program objectives are related to academic, effective, and behavioral achievements.

1. Each student will show gains in reading skills at twice the rate of his/her previous acquisition, as measured by pre and post change scores from relevant tests.

Post test scores from the Prescriptive Reading Test were not available to the evaluators at the time of the writing of this report. It was not possible to obtain change scores relevant to reading skills for the 1977-78 school year or to make comparisons over years of changes in acquisition of reading skills.

It is important that crucial pre and post measures such as PRT reading scores be available for analysis during the evaluation phase of programs. The evaluators recognize the difficulty in expediting the processing and scoring, usually done by the developer, of such tests.

Data from interviews with program personnel, student, parent and program personnel responses to questionnaires, and direct observation of program activities support the conclusion that (1) instructional activities designed to facilitate the learning of reading skills are occurring and (2) program personnel believe that students are learning to read or building their reading skills and showing an increase in interest in reading in general.

2. Each student will show significant growth in positive motivation to read, as measured by pre and post change scores on the reading section of the Estes Attitude Scale and five additional items relevant to attitudes toward television viewing.

An analysis of the pre and post scores from the Estes Attitude Scale shows the following changes:

a. Students moved from a positive to a more positive attitude toward reading.

b. Students moved from a negative to a positive attitude about television viewing.

c. Students moved from preferring television to preferring reading.

These changes were greater in schools that had a more complete Television Reading Program in operation. These findings are at best preliminary and based upon small samples of data.

Analysis of all the data available to the evaluators showed that students enjoy using the scripts and seem to be more motivated to attend to the lessons. Direct observations in some of the classrooms showed a majority of the students were on task and interested in what they were doing much of the time.

The evaluators learned that a number of teachers felt that students participating in the program demonstrated improved behavior in the classroom, improved reading skills, and tended to read more at school. Teachers said things like: "My students may cut other classes, but they come to my class," "They want to come in and try," "The program is a tremendous aid to motivation," "They are learning words and thier meaning more quickly," and "It's too soon to tell--we just got the program a couple of weeks ago."

Fifty-four percent of the program personnel who had been asked in a paper and pencil questionnaire if there had been an increase in attendance since the start of the program responded affirmatively. There seems to be differences among schools, or at least differences in the way teachers assigned to these schools respond in teachers' ratings of "increase in attendance."

Program personnel reported that student interest in reading is being reinforced by the program.

Another question relating to positive motivation to read has to do with the availability and use of lending libraries in each classroom. The differences in the level of development and frequency of use of classroom libraries were apparent after examination of the classrooms and analysis of teachers' and students' responses to questions about the libraries.

3. Students in the Special Education Learning Centers whose primary handicaps are academic deficiencies will be mainstreamed at a rate faster than the rate of mainstreaming of academically deficient children who are not participating in the program.

Because the program has been in operation for only a few months, the effects of the program on students' achievements can, at best, be only a fraction of what might have been expected had the program run for two full semesters.

Students who participated in the program were exposed to various other instructional activities (from September 1977 to at least February 1978) prior to the start of the Television Reading Program.

Therefore, it is premature to attempt to speak of changes in the rate of mainstreaming as a result of participation in the Television Reading Program.

4. Students of junior high school age with identified reading deficiencies and behavioral problems will show a reduction of inappropriate behaviors during the reading session, as measured by change scores from pre and post observations recorded on the Powell Behavior Rating Inventory developed by the Region III Division of Special Education.

Behavioral problems of students were measured in three ways: the ratings by teachers on the Powell Behavior Rating Inventory; observations by the outside evaluator's staff, both anecdotal and in forms that could produce quantitative behavioral ratings; and teachers' general impressions and comments. The pre and post measures yielded by the Inventory showed more appropriate and fewer inappropriate behaviors of these junior high school age students with reading and behavior problems. On the evaluation forms, both external and internal, teachers reported the same improvements. These general findings were greater in schools which the evaluators believed (based on direct observations) had to that point more of the still new Television Reading Program.

Teachers, whether initially skeptical or critical, seem to have been overwhelmingly won over to the approach of building reading (which had been deficient) around a well developed behavior system (watching television shows and reading the accompanying scripts and discussing the program, the script, the ideas, etc.). To a person it was the big and quite rapid improvement in the students' interest to learn reading better and in the students' progress that persuaded even the initially reluctant teachers.

5. Students will show an increase in "free reading" (free reading defined as reading unassigned literature), as measured by changes in the student's frequency of use of the classroom library.

The data collected does not include evidence that specifically endorses the hypothesis of an increase in reading of unassigned literature. It is assumed that the increased motivation and desire

to read as well as a change in attitudes toward reading will lead to (if it hasn't already) increased reading of unassigned literature. Although the evaluators do not have the direct evidence to support this hypothesis, all of the necessary prerequisites seem to be developing nicely.

A Lending Library Form was developed by program personnel. No data has yet been received from this form, although this tool for collecting direct evidence is certainly available for use and seems likely to be used in the 1978-79 school year.

The findings show that students participating in the Television Reading Program showed an increased motivation to read. Eighty-eight percent of the parents who responded to a parent questionnaire felt that their children seem to be more interested in reading at the end of the school year than they had been at the beginning of the school year.

Nearly all of the program personnel responding to the Evaluation Form administered by program administrators endorsed a statement that the Television Reading Program increased the students' motivation to read. Teachers wrote comments such as "Students would ask to take the script home," "Improves their interest in wanting to read," "Beneficial in helping me change the attitudes of students towards reading," and "Not enough time to explore the extent of their outside reading."

VI. Selected References

1. Comstock, G. Television and Human Behavior: the Key Studies. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1975.

2. Lefkowitz, M. M., Eron, L. D., Walder, L. O., and Huesmann, L. R. Growing Up to be Violent: A Longitudinal Study of the Development of Aggression. Elmsford, N. Y.: Pergamon Press, 1977. (Note especially section on social attainment, pp. 153-159.)

3. Liebert, R. M., Neale, J. M., and Davidson, E. S. The Early Windows: Effects of Television on Children and Youth. Elmsford, N. Y.: Pergamon Press, 1973. (Note especially chapter 6 "Television's Potential: Prosocial effects".)

4. Waters, H. F. "What TV Does to Kids" Newsweek, February 21, 1977, pp. 62-70.

VII. APPENDICES

A. Discussion of Estes Attitude Scale and the Powell Behavior Rating Inventory

B. Face to Face Interview/Program Personnel

C. Face to Face Interview/Student

D. Paper and Pencil Questionnaire/Program Personnel

E. Paper and Pencil Questionnaire/Student

F. Paper and Pencil Questionnaire/Parent

G. Direct Observation Checklist

H. List of Tables
(Developed by Evaluators and available upon request.)

Appendix A

The Estes Attitude Scale used on this project is an adaptation from one presented by Estes (see Table 14 for the correspondence between Estes' scale and the one used in this project) in 1969 and 1971. In his 1971 version he had twelve negative items and eight positive ones. He recommended scoring as follows:

Response	Scoring Recommended by Estes (1971) Negative Items	Positive Items
Strongly agree (SA)	1	5
Agree (A)	2	4
Undecided (U)	3	3
Disagree (D)	4	2
Strongly disagree (SD)	5	1

Thus, a strong agreement on a negative item such as #1 "Reading is for learning but not for enjoyment" earn the student a 1 (one); a strong disagreement to the same item or any of the other negative items earns a 5 (five). Similarly a strong agreement to a positive item such as #2 "Money spent on books is well spent" yield a 5 (five), etc. With this scoring system a simple sum of the twenty item scores yields a total score which can range from a low of 20 (presumably a most unfavorable attitude toward reading) to a high of 100 (the most favorable attitude measured by this test). The two scoring patterns were not retained by the D. C. Schools' Television Reading project staff. We recommend that Estes' two patterns (one for positive and one for negative items) be reinstated.

In our analysis, we did not sum scores across items. We thereby bypassed or avoided some troublesome assumptions such as the assumption of the several items being in one scale, that the scale has internal consistency in that they all measure the "same thing" and warrant summing across the items. We thereby also avoided the issue of two scroing patterns as well as the assumption of interval measurement (e.g., that the psychological distance from 1 to 2 is the same as from 2 to 3 and is half as much as from 2 to 4).

Adaptation of Estes Attitude Scale
(Original and revised versions)

Estes		D.C. Schools Project	
Category	(Estes' judgment of category)	Category	(BSC's judgment of category)
-	1. Reading is for learning but not for enjoyment.(to #1)	-	1. Reading is for learning but not for enjoyment.(from #1)
+	2. Money spent on books is well spent.(rev to #2?)	-	*2. Spending allowance on books is a waste of good money.(rev from #2?)
-	3. There is nothing to be gained from reading books. (dropped)		
-	4. Books are a bore. (to #4)	+	4. Books are a bore.(from #4)
+	5. Reading is a good way to spend spare time. (revised to #3)	+	*3. Reading is a good way to spend time.(rev. from #5)
-	6. Sharing books in class is a waste of time.(dropped)		
+	7. Reading turns me on.(dropped)		
-	8. Reading is only for grade grubbers. (dropped)		
-	9. Books arene't usually good enough to finish. (to #7)	-	7. Books aren't usually good enough to finish (from #9)
+	10. Reading is rewarding to me. (to #6)	+	6. Reading is rewarding to me. (From #10)
-	11. Reading becomes boring after about an hour. (to #8)	-	8. Reading becomes boring after about an hour (from #11)
-	12. Most books are too long and dull. (to #9)	-	9. Most books are too long and dull. (from #12)
-	13. Free reading doesn't teach anything. (dropped)		
+	14. There should be more time for free reading during the school day. (dropped)		
+	15. There are many books which I hope to read.(to #10)	+	10. There are many books which I hope to read. (from #15)
-	16. Books should not be read except for class requirements. (rev. to #11)	-	*11. Books should only be read when they are assigned. (rev. from #16)

* Revised wording
** New item

(continued)

Estes		D. C. Schools Project	
Category	(Estes' judgment of category)	Category	(BSC's judgment of category)
-	17. Reading is something I can do without. (to #12)	-	12. Reading is something I can do without. (from #17)
+	18. A certain amount of summer vacation should be set aside for reading. (rev. to #13)	+	*13. Some part of my summer vacation should be set aside for reading. (rev. from #18)
+	19. Books make good presents. (to #14)	+	14. Books made good presents. (from #19)
-	20. Reading is dull. (to #15)	-	15. Reading is dull. (from #20)
		+ TV - reading	** 5. Watching television is better than reading. (new-t.v. vs. reading)
		+?	**16. Parents should watch t.v. with their children. (new-t.v.)
		+ TV	**17. Watching t.v. is a good way to learn about life. (new-t.v.)
		+?	**18. T.V. is for enjoyment but not for learning. (new-t.v.)
		- TV	**19. T.V. is not worth watching. (new-t.v.)
		+ TV	**20. Teachers should talk about T.V. with their classes.

An examination of the above shows that the Estes' scale had twelve items which were negative about reading and eight positive ones. The D. C. Schools Television Reading project's adaptation retained six negative ones as is and two other negative items with some revisions; it dropped four negative items. The adaptation retained four positive items as is and two other positive ones with some revisions; it dropped two positive items. Six new items about television viewing were added, two possibly positive toward television, one surely positive toward television, one surely negative toward television, and one which compares television to reading with television occupying the favored and reading the unfavored position.

---

* Revised wording

** New item

We believe that the adapted Estes scale needs to be used and, with experience, it can be better understood. For example, with a larger sample, one could calculate inter-item and item-total correlations to look at internal consistency (i.e., are they similar enough to warrant summing across items?). In the meantime, looking at characteristics of individual items as is done in this evaluation can yield useful information.

One may find items which are quite stable over time; that is, some attitudes toward reading and television may not change. Other items might be quite changeable, especially with certain types of intervention, e.g., with the Television Reading Program or "just" with the student getting older. Both types of items can be valuable--obviously for different purposes. The responses people give to a stable item might well describe a person or group of people; the change in responses after some intervention program might well describe the effects of the program.

The Powell Behavior Rating Inventory is a system for use by the teacher to rate each student on seventeen specified classroom behaviors. There are eight positive behaviors and nine negative ones. Four possible ratings are available for each behavior: Rarely, Sometimes, Usually, and Always. The instructions define how to rate and on what basis and with what kind of evidence. The forms for the rater and the scorer which are both comprehensive enough and simple enough appear in the Appendices section below. Pre and post testing are encouraged by the instructions.

Each of the seventeen items, according to the directions, is to be scored based upon the rating given as follows:

Rating	Score
Rarely	0
Sometimes	1
Usually	2
Always	3

These scores for each student are to be transcribed onto the summary sheet which shows the pre and post scores on each of the seventeen items of behavior. The user is encouraged by the instructions to get a sum of scores by adding.

It would seem reasonable to this reviewer that there should be two scoring systems, one for the positive items and another for the negative ones, perhaps as follows:

	Score	
Rating	Positive Item	Negative Item
Rarely	0	3
Sometimes	1	2
Usually	2	1
Always	3	0

Thus, in general a higher score would mean either more positive behavior or less negative behavior.

A second concern is that of summing across the seventeen items. Summing assumes some unitary or at least coherent aspect to the set of seventeen items, the ratings made to the wordings of the items, and the behaviors being rated. This is an empirical question which must therefore be answered by experience with this device.

Our experience with the Powell Behavior Rating Inventory suggests that the ratings across the various items do vary together. We looked at pre to post changes on ten of the seventeen questions. They all showed about the same type of change, improvement from ratings of behaviors made before the Television Reading Program started to ratings made at the end of the school year (i.e., after the program had been underway for two or three months). While we had no control groups, we noticed that, in general, the schools which we rated as having the most complete Television Reading Program showed the largest improvement. Further, we found that this same type of change took place in the student's self described attitude toward reading and television. Note that this covariation of (1) our rating of amount of Television Reading Program available to the students, (2) the teachers' pre and post ratings of their students' several behaviors in class, and (3) the students' pre and post descriptions of their own several attitudes toward television and reading provides positive evidence not only for the measuring devices but for the concept that the Television Reading Program has substantial, measurable (from three data sources--our staff, the teachers, and the students) positive effects.

While validity, as evidenced just above, depends on reliability and objectivity of the measuring device, we do not as yet have information on the Powell's reliability and objectivity. The fact that these are clearly defined, observable behaviors (a testimony to the test constructor of this device) would give reason to expect objective ratings. Inter-item co-variation suggests adequate reliability. Further studies on the Powell would certainly be most desirable.

Appendix B

SPECIAL EDUCATION TELEVISION READING PROGRAM

FACE TO FACE INTERVIEW

Date: Person Interviewed:

Starting Time: School:

Ending Time: Interviewer:

1. What is your position here at _____ School? How many years have you been at this school?

2. What is your position with the T.V. Reading Program? What are your responsibilities?

3. What is your background in this area? Have you ever worked with a reading program or a program that involved audiovisual equipment before?

4. Who are the staff members here at _____ School who are involved with the T. V. Reading Program? What do they do?

Personnel	Responsibilities

Face to Face Interview
Page 2

5. What contact do you or others have with program personnel involved with the program at other schools?

6. What types of teacher training activities that are directly related to the T. V. Reading Program have occurred this year? What have you yourself participated in?

7. How did the idea for this program get started?

8. Were you involved with the proposal writing?

9. What, in your opinion, are the objectives of the T. V. Reading Program?

10. What activities are included in the T. V. Reading Program? How often does each occur?

Activity	Frequency of Occurrence

11. How are/were children selected for participation in the program?

12. How many children are participating in the program here at _____ school

13. What portion of a child's day/week is spent involved in program-related activities at school? Please describe a typical day's/week's sequence of activities.

Activity

14. What kinds of home-based activities for children are suggested as part of the program curriculum? Do they occur?

15. What types of parent training have been available for parents this school year? What are/were the goals of the training?

Training | Goals

16. How would you rate the involvement level of the program of the majority of parents whose children are participants?

_____ High/very involved
_____ Moderately involved
_____ a little involved
_____ not involved at all

17. What kinds of activities are parents involved with—that is, how do they work with their children and/or the school as part of this program?

18. How are children evaluated, how frequently, and by whom? That is, what teacher-made and standardized instruments/techniques are used to measure children's progress?

19. What aspects of a child's development are evaluated?

20. Are you satisfied with the materials available? (scripts, tapes, audiovisual equipment) If yes, why? If not, what changes would you make?

21. Does each child work with the same script and tape or do children progress at their own pace through available scripts?

22. Are children allowed to select scripts and tapes according to their interest and ability level?

23. Is this program having a positive effect on children? In what areas/ways are they changing?

_____ read more at school
_____ read more at home
_____ read better
_____ use school library more
_____ get ready faster to return to regular (non-special education) program
_____ behave better

24. Is this program having a negative effect on children?

25. What is working well?

26. What needs changing?

27. Is there anything else you'd like to tell us or are there any questions we should be asking?

SPECIAL EDUCATION TELEVISION READING PROGRAM

Face to Face Interview/Student

Date: Person Interviewed:

Starting Time School:

Closing Time: Interviewer:

1. How old are you? _____

2. How long have you been here at _____ School? _____

3. What grade are you in? _____

4. Is there anything different about the way you do reading lessons in school this year?

5. Do you get to see television shows during reading period? _____
   Do you like watching the shows you see during reading period? _____

6. Which television shows have you seen this year?

Show	Like/Dislike

7. Do you get to use scripts for each t.v. show? _____
   If yes, how do you use these scripts?

8. Is there a library in your classroom?

9. Are you allowed to use it? _____ Do you use it?

10. Do you ever use your scripts or other things you learn in reading class at home? _____

11. Is there anything else about school or yourself that you would like to tell us?

Appendix D

SPECIAL EDUCATION TELEVISION READING PROGRAM

PROGRAM PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE

School _____

Length of time at this school _____

Position _____

Length of time with Special Education Television Reading Program _____

Position with program (if different from position in school) _____

BEHAVIOR SERVICE CONSULTANTS BSC

Below are some questions concerning your experiences with, observations about, and suggestions concerning the Special Education Television Reading Program. Please use this opportunity to give us feedback about this program. Statements about various aspects of the program have been grouped by program component and listed in the left hand column. To their right, please rate (according to your own experience and knowledge) whether they are part of the Special Education Television Reading Program. If you feel that you do not know enough about a particular aspect of the program to rate it, please circle "I don't know."

Thank you.

Question	Response (please circle one answer)		
I. Materials and Supplies			
1. Audiovisual equipment has been purchased and is available for use by teachers in the Television Reading Program.	yes	no	I don't know
2. Video tapes of television programs have been purchased and are available to teachers in the Television Reading Program.	yes	no	I don't know
3. Scripts of television programs have been obtained and are available for use by teachers in the Television Reading Program.	yes	no	I don't know
4. Teacher-made learning materials appropriate for use in the Television Reading Program have been developed.	yes	no	I don't know
II. Instructional Activities			
5. Taped television programs are presented as part of the Television Reading Program.	yes	no	I don't know
6. Scripts that accompany the television programs are used.	yes	no	I don't

Question	Response		
7. Lending libraries have been developed in each classroom.	yes	no	I don't know
8. Student interest in reading is being reinforced.	yes	no	I don't know
III. Training Activities			
9. Teachers in the Television Reading Program have been trained in the use of audio-visual equipment used in the Television Reading Program.	yes	no	I don't know
10. Teachers have received adequate training in the use of Television Reading Program instructional techniques.	yes	no	I don't know
11. Parents have been trained to help their children with the use of television program scripts at home.	yes	no	I don't know
IV. Parent and Community Involvement			
12. Parents have received information about the Television Reading Program through newsletters, parent orientation sessions, P.T.A., or Advisory Council meetings.	yes	no	I don't know
13. Parents have been kept up to date on their child's progress in the Television Reading Program.	yes	no	I don't know
V. Evaluation			
14. The reading skills of students in the program are evaluated with standardized tests.	yes	no	I don't know
15. The reading skills of students in the program are evaluated with teacher-made tests.	yes	no	I don't know
16. Has there been an increase in attendance in your reading class since the start of the Television Reading Program?	yes	no	I don't know
17. Would you like to see the program continue?	yes	no	I don't know

18. Is there anything else about the Television Reading Program that you would like to tell us or that you feel we should know? Any further comments would be helpful.

Appendix E

Name _____

School _____

QUESTIONNAIRE/STUDENT

SPECIAL EDUCATION TELEVISION READING PROGRAM

We want to learn about the Television Reading Program in your school. Below are several questions. Please answer "yes", "no" or "I don't know" to each of the fir four questions. Put a circle around the word or words that best describe how you feel. Then, write in your answer to question #5.

Question	Response (Please circle only one answer)		
1. Do you watch television shows during reading class in school?	yes	no	I don't know
2. Do you work with television scripts during reading class in school?	yes	no	I don't know
3. Do you like using the scripts?	yes	no	I don't know
4. Is there a library in the classroom?	yes	no	I don't know
5. What are your four favorite television shows?	1. _____		
	2. _____		
	3. _____		
	4. _____		

BEHAVIOR SERVICE CONSULTANTS: TESC

SPECIAL EDUCATION T.V. READING PROGRAM - PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE Appendix F

Dear Parents:

We would like to know about the Special Education Television Reading Program at your child's school. Your answers will help us help your children. Please return this questionnaire to your child's teacher no later than Wednesday, June 14, 1978. Thank you.

Behavior Service Consultants, Inc.
Outside evaluators for D. C. Public Schools, Special Education Television Reading Program

BEHAVIOR SERVICE CONSULTANTS, INC BSC

Part A

Below are several questions. Please answer "yes", "no" or "I don't know" for each of the first four questions.

Question	Response (Please circle only one answer)		
1. Does your child see television shows as part of his/her reading lesson at school?	yes	no	I don't know
2. Does your child work with television scripts during reading lessons at school?	yes	no	I don't know
3. Does your child seem to be more interested in reading now than in the beginning of the school year?	yes	no	I don't know
4. Do you use television scripts and programs to help your child read?	yes	no	I don't know

Part B

Place a checkmark beside each of the answers that describes your experience with the T.V. Reading Program. You may check more than one answer.

5. I have heard about the T.V. Reading Program from:

_____ my child	_____ meeting with my child's teacher
_____ school newsletter	_____ parent training session
_____ P.T.A. meetings	_____ Advisory Council Meeting
_____ telephone call from my child's teacher	_____ have not heard of it

(over)

. My involvement with this program has been:

_____ I have helped my child work with a script at home.

_____ I have observed a reading lesson at school in which television programs and scripts were used.

_____ I have attended a training session during which I was shown how to use the television scripts and programs.

_____ I talk to my child about his work in the Television Reading Program.

_____ I talk to my child's teacher about my child's work in the Television Reading Program.

TELEVISION READING PROGRAM

DIRECT OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

Date of Site Visit:_____ Visit #:_____

School:_____

Observer:_____

Classroom Observed:_____

I. Physical Environment

Layout of Room:

Furniture:

Physical Materials/Audiovisual Equipment

Scripts:

Lessons:

On Board	In Progress

II. Program Participants

Number of teachers: _____

Number of teacher-aides: _____

Number of children: _____

Activity in progress:

Comments:

III. Decorative/Educational Materials:

IV. Diagnostic/Evaluation Materials:

Student Record Folders:

Somewhat developed _____

Well developed _____

If some, how did it get started?

If none, how could folders be developed?

Contents: Diagnoses, Prescriptions, Student Contracts

Charts: Examples/Contents

Folder #1:

Folder #2:

Library:

_____ Somewhat developed Student Library Cards _____

_____ Well developed

Contents:

Start Time: _____ Min. Sec.	BEHAVIORS Teacher: Said + Academic; Said + Social; Said - Academic; Said - Social	Child: Acad. + -	Child: Social + -	Count: Group
1 10 20 30 40 50 COUNT				Size Group: # on task: W/Te: W/Peers: Indepen: Other: # Off task: Other:
2 10 20 30 40 50 COUNT				Size Group: # on task: W/Te: W/Peers: Indepen: Other: # Off task: Other:
3 10 20 30 40 50 COUNT				Size Group: # on task: W/Te: W/Peers: Indepen: Other: # Off task: Other:

COMMENTS:

BEHAVIOR: Student Involvement

Start Time:_____

Min	Sec	On or Off Task	Raising Hand	Answering Question/ Volunteering	Playing Game, etc.	Reading Aloud	Reading Silently	Watching Television
1	10							
	20							
	30							
	40							
	50							
Size of Group								
1	10							
	20							
	30							
	40							
	50							
Size of Group								
1	10							
	20							
	30							
	40							
	50							
Size of Group								

COMMENTS:

XIII. Table of Tables

Table No.	Title
1	Responses of program personnel to question #9 regarding "Teachers in the Television Reading Program have been trained in the use of audivisual equipment used in the Television Reading Program."
2	Responses of program personnel to question #10 regarding "Teachers have received adequate training in the use of Television Reading Program instruction techniques."
3	Responses of program personnel to question #1 regarding "Audiovisual equipment has been purchased and is available for use by teachers in the Television Reading Program."
4	Responses of program personnel to question #2 "Video tapes of television programs have been purchased and are available to teachers in the Television Reading Program."
5	Responses of program personnel to question #3 regarding "Scripts of television programs have been obtained and are available for use by teachers in the Television Reading Program."
6	Responses of program personnel to question #5 regarding "Taped television programs are presented as part of the Television Reading Program."
7	Responses of program personnel to question #6 regarding "Scripts that accompany the television programs are used."
8	Responses of students to question #1 regarding "Do you watch television shows during reading class in school?"
9	Responses of students to question #2 regarding "Do you work with television scripts during reading class in school?"
10	Responses of program personnel to question #5 on Television Reading Project's own evaluation form regarding "Frequency of use of television monitor and scripts."
11	Responses of program personnel to same form as in Table 10.

Table of Tables (continued)

Table No.	Title
12	Responses of program personnel to question #4 regarding "Teacher-made learning materials appropriate for use in the Television Reading Program have been developed."
13	Responses of students to question #5 regarding "What are your four favorite television shows?"
14	Responses of program personnel to question #12 regarding "Parents have received information about the Television Reading Program through newsletters, parent orientation sessions, P.T.A. meetings, or Advisory Council Meetings."
15	Responses of program personnel to question #13 regarding "Parents have been kept up to date on their child's progress in the Television Reading Program."
16	Responses of program personnel to question #11 regarding "Parents have been trained to help their children with the use of television program scripts at home."
17	Responses of program personnel to question #16 regarding "Has there been an increase in attendance in your reading class since the start of the Television Reading Program?".
18	Responses of program personnel to question #8 regarding "Student interest in reading is being reinforced."
19	Responses of program personnel to question #7 regarding "Lending libraries have been developed in each classroom."
20	Responses of program personnel to question #14 regarding "The reading skills of students in the program are evaluated with standardized tests."
21	Responses of program personnel to question #15 regarding "The reading skills of students in the program are evaluated with teacher-made tests."

Table of Tables (continued)

Table No.	Title
22	Responses of program personnel to question #17 regarding "Would you like to see the program continue?".
23	School and code numbers.
24	Site Visits

Attachments

1. Evaluation Form Developed by Program Personnel

2. Estes Attitude Scale

3. Powell Behavior Rating Inventory Scoring Information

4. Powell Behavior Rating Inventory

5. Lending Library Form

Attachment 1

Date: _____

T. V. Reading Evaluation Form

Program _____ Number of Students _____

Reading Level Range _____ Age Range _____

1. What was your initial attitude concerning this Special Education T.V. Reading Program?
_____
_____
_____

2. What is your attitude now?
_____
_____
_____

3. Have you enjoyed participating in this program? _____

4. Do you think your students have enjoyed participating in this program? _____

5. How often were the tv monitor and scripts used? _____
Scripts only? _____ Monitor only? _____

6. Did this T.V. Reading Program increase the students' motivation to read? _____
Explain: _____
_____

7. Was there a noticeable change in behavior? _____
Explain: _____
_____

8. Was there a noticeable difference in reaction to the program between boys and girls?
Explain: _____
_____

9. How often were you able to coordinate skills developed through the T.V. Reading Program with other learning skills being taught? _____
_____
_____

10. Did you receive all the support you needed from the T.V. Reading Staff? _____
From your local school staff? _____
If not, please explain. _____
_____
_____

11. Which workshop were most beneficial? _____
Workshops least beneficial? _____
Suggestions for future workshops: _____
_____
_____

Date: _____

12. What has been the overall effectiveness of this Special Education T.V. Reading Program? _____

13. What has been the overall effectiveness of T.V. Reading Workshops? _____

14. Would you like to see the program continue? _____
Would you be an active participant? _____

15. Other Comments: _____

Name _____ Grade _____ Teacher _____

School _____ Program _____

Pretest Date _____ Posttest Date _____

ESTES ATTITUDE SCALE

Pretest		Postest	Differential
1. ____	1. Reading is for learning but not for enjoyment. SA A U D SD	1. ____	1. ____
2. ____	2. Spending allowance on books is a waste of good money. SA A U D SD	2. ____	2. ____
3. ____	3. Reading is a good way to spend time. SA A U D SD	3. ____	3. ____
4. ____	4. Books are a bore. SA A U D SD	4. ____	4. ____
5. ____	5. Watching t. v. is better than reading. SA A U D SD	5. ____	5. ____
6. ____	6. Reading is rewarding to me. SA A U D SD	6. ____	6. ____
7. ____	7. Books aren't usually good enough to finish. SA A U D SD	7. ____	7. ____
8. ____	8. Reading becomes boring after about an hour. SA A U D SD	8. ____	8. ____
9. ____	9. Most books are too long and too dull. SA A U D SD	9. ____	9. ____
10. ____	10. There are many books which I hope to read. SA A U D SD	10. ____	10. ____
11. ____	11. Books should only be read when they are assigned. SA A U D SD	11. ____	11. ____
12. ____	12. Reading is something I can do without. SA A U D SD	12. ____	12. ____
13. ____	13. Some part of my summer vacation should be set aside for reading. SA A U D SD	13. ____	13. ____
14. ____	14. Books make good presents. SA A U D SD	14. ____	14. ____
15. ____	15. Reading is dull. SA A U D SD	15. ____	15. ____
16. ____	16. Parents should watch t. v. with their children. SA A U D SD	16. ____	16. ____
17. ____	17. Watching t.v. is a good way to learn about life. SA A U D SD	17. ____	17. ____
18. ____	18. T.V. is for enjoyment but not for learning. SA A U D SD	18. ____	18. ____
19. ____	19. T.V. is not worth watching. SA A U D SD	19. ____	19. ____
20. ____	20. Teachers should talk about t.v. with their classes. SA A U D SD	20. ____	20. ____

Key

SA = Strongly agree
A = Agree
U = Undecided
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

Scoring

Each score will be weighted on a five point scale (SA=4, A=3, U=2, D=1, SD=0). The sum of the scores is computed by adding. To determine pretest-posttest results, the differences between the two scores is then computed to determine the rate of growth between the pre and post test administration.

Pre-test/Post-test

The POWELL behavior rating inventory contains seventeen items which are designed to be used in rating students by the classroom t eacher. Using a four point Likert type scale each item will be weighted based on the variables of rarely, usually, sometimes, or always in relationship to the occurance of the specified behaviors.

After giving consideration to each item in terms of the individual pupil the teacher is asked to circle the most appropriate response choice. As this instrument will be used as both a pre and post test measure the teacher is asked to concentrate on immediate and not future or perceived probable behaviors.

RARELY:

rarely means that the student exhibits this behavior less than 15% of the time

USUALLY:

usually means that the student exhibits this behavior more than 50% of the time

SOMETIMES:

sometimes means that the student exhibits this behavior less than 50% of the time

ALWAYS:

always means that the student exhibits this behavior approximately 90% of the time

SCORING:

Each score will be weighted on a four point scale.

R = 0
S = 1
U = 2
A = 3

The sum of the scores is computed by adding. To determine pre-test post-test results, the difference between the two scores is then computed to determine the rate of growth between the pre and post test administration.

Pre-test / Postest

POWELL BEHAVIOR RATING INVENTORY

_____ DATE_____

1. Talking to others during instruction. —
   R U S A
2. Sits in seat during instruction. +
   R U S A
3. Out of seat during instruction. —
   R U S A
4. Comes into class late consistently. —
   R U S A
5. Comes into the class with materials. +
   R U S A
6. Comes into the class on time. +
   R U S A
7. Curses or uses abusive language in class. —
   R U S A
8. Provokes fights during class. —
   R U S A
9. Pays attention to the teacher during instruction. +
   R U S A
10. Arrives to class early. +
    R U S A
11. Takes assigned seat upon arrival to class. +
    R U S A
12. Eats or chews gum during instruction. —
    R U S A
13. Takes part in the class discussion. +
    R U S A
14. Show no interest in participating in class discusoions. —
    R U S A
15. Interrupts during instruction by calling out. —
    R U S A
16. Refuses to complete in class assignments. —
    R U S A
17. Show an interest in the assigned materials.
    R U S A

KEY
R = rarely
U = usually
S = sometimes
A = always

REGION III - DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
TV Reading Program

LENDING LIBRARY FORM

STUDENT'S NAME: _____

STUDENT'S ADDRESS: _____

STUDENT'S HOME PHONE: _____

TEACHER'S NAME: _____

ROOM NUMBER: _____

NAME OF SCHOOL: _____

TITLE OF READING MATERIAL(S):

_____ Number: _____

_____ Number: _____

_____ Number: _____

_____ Number: _____

DATE(S) OF LOAN:

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____
Teacher's Signature

DATE(S) OF RETURN:

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____
Teacher's Signature

TVRP/1